

May 8, 1973

didn't support Senator Curtis, he might have beaten Senator Carpenter by the same percentage or the same number of votes if he hadn't spent a dime more than Senator Carpenter did. It was wasted money and the bad thing about it, in addition to the wasted money is the commitments that are made and the things that could be done because of that wasted money. Now maybe I'm sounding more like a preacher than a politician, but I think we are terribly wrong to laugh this one out and to laugh Senator Warner's bill out because it proposed strict reporting. The fact is that this last campaign, people that were running for federal office, Congress and the Senate, were required to have strict reporting. There were even provisions in there like these requiring approval and authority to expend money. They weren't a problem to enforce. This whole area is one that every politician--and we're all politicians in this body--every politician has chosen to ignore. It seems to me that Watergate no longer allows us to ignore this and to laugh this out the way Senator Proud does in a magnificent dramatic, not dramatic but in a humorous speech employing dramatic talents that he has in abundance, I think ultimately brings a laugh at a good Senator. I don't know that he really wants a state, a political society where we have, where anything goes. Every one of you in this room are aware and have seen the excesses that come from unlimited spending. I'm disappointed frankly in that nobody has really raised the legitimate problems with this bill, the question of whether it's unfavorably treats, or unfairly favors an incumbent. The fact of whether it really is a Democrat's bill over a Republican's because traditionally in this country, or in this state, the Republicans have had more money to raise and therefore have spent more money. Those would be legitimate issues to raise. But to laugh this out I think brings discredit to everyone of us. I'm willing to vote for this type of bill, I'm willing to see stronger penalties put in and stronger limitations. I'm for Senator Warner's bill requiring stricter reporting and it would seem to me that every one of us who blithely says he is for good government whenever he's asked should take pretty seriously a negative vote on this issue. Those of us who support this bill, even if we are only one or two or even only one, as that board lit up earlier this afternoon, I think will have the last laugh when we will be able to say, at least we tried to begin to make sense out of political campaign spending. I hope I've answered your question.

PRESIDENT: Senator Duis.

SENATOR DUIS: Well, Senator Fellman, I didn't think we needed to ask which party introduced the bill because the two that introduced the bills I think, Senator Warner and Senator Fellman, we probably would know where they came from. But what my question, and you asked for amendments to the bill Senator Fellman, is this. In section 3, page 3, in case of a general election or a special election called for the purpose of electing a candidate to office other than a primary election or special primary election, a candidate covered by the provisions of this act may not expend for advertising. The thing here is, I'm wondering how do you keep any other organizations through this bill from expanding money. In other words, you just say a candidate. Now for instance, we were talking about the Governor's Club and this and that and having a dozen different organizations working and I don't think your bill covers this. Now this is the problem I have. I don't think your bill covers anything except the candidate and the candidate is probably the one that spends the least amount of money. It's the other organizations that are out working for them. Now can you give me an explanation, or do you have an amendment to correct this?

PRESIDENT: Senator Fellman.